

All communications respecting this application should give the serial number, date of filing and name of the applicant.



**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Application Number	Filing Date	First Named Applicant	Attorney Docket Number
09/339,818	06/25/99	Davis	CTCH-P02-012

Examiner
L. E. Crane

Art Unit	Paper No.
1623	32

DATE MAILED: n/a

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel)

(1) Mr. Matthew Vincent (3) --
(2) Examiner L. E. Crane (4) --

Date of Interview: 05/08/03

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy given to) ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: See attachment.

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some of all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached

Claim(s) discussed: See page 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: See page 2.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: See p. 2.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would be allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 713.04) If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, the completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

PTOL-413 (amended 03/13/01)

09/339,818 - P. N. 32

COPY FOR ☒ File ☐ Applicant

Continued on next page(s) -->

Art Unit 1623

INTERVIEW SUMMARY(cont.)

Claims discussed: All remaining of record, claim 1 in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed: The Kosak patent and parent application.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: Applicant was advised that examiner had received a substantial submission, but that one reference (Mark Davis is the sole author and is pictured on first page) could not be made of record because it failed to include a title page or another page identifying the requisite bibliographic information (journal name, volume(issue), and month and year of publication). Examiner the indicated to applicant that the Breslow declaration had been reviewed and that examiner concluded that Breslow had not entirely excluded the Kosak patent reference from consideration as prior art. In addition examiner indicated that applicant's claims had been searched to the degree this was possible, but that claim 1 could not be searched in its entirety because variable "A" had not been adequately defined in claim 1. Examiner also indicated that the instant claims were not allowable and that applicant would be receiving an Advisory Action to this effect in due course.